

**Early Modern Queens Consort and Dowager and Diplomatic Gifts**  
**Tracey A. Sowerby**  
**(University of Oxford)**

Early modern queens consort and dowager wielded power and influence in a variety of ways. Their lands made them important patrons and landlords, while some became influential figures in religious circles through their ecclesiastical patronage.<sup>1</sup> Authorship also offered non-regnant queens important opportunities to articulate their position on issues, build a reputation, and participate in literary culture at court.<sup>2</sup> Recent scholarship has further revealed how central material culture was to the political agency of consorts and dowagers. Whether through the iconography of their portraits, the politics of how they chose to display the works of art that they possessed, the items they bought and even their sartorial choices non-regnant queens used material and visual culture to self-fashion and to engage in contemporary politics.<sup>3</sup> Gifts were vital to how royal women shaped their reputations, participated in patron-client relations, and commented upon policies.<sup>4</sup> This was no less true of the diplomatic gift-giving in which non-regnant queens participated.

Gifts exchanged between sovereigns indicated an acknowledgement of mutual sovereignty, as the acceptance of a gift from a ruler implied the acceptance of the legitimacy of his or her position, and indicated the honour and favour that the donor attached to the recipient. Princely gifts were therefore a means of claiming status within the international society of honour.<sup>5</sup> As Maija Jansson has outlined, diplomatic gifts could create reciprocal exchanges between princes; consequently, they were a necessary part of the relationships between early modern royals.<sup>6</sup> The gifts queens consort and dowager were given, and the reception that met the gifts they gave, therefore served both as acknowledgement of the queens' position and a barometer of how important the queens were perceived to be. Gifts were an important means by which international reputations were forged<sup>7</sup> and they offered non-regnant queens opportunities to communicate symbolically their views on international politics.

This article explores the understudied subject of the involvement of queens consort and dowager in diplomacy through the specific prism of diplomatic gift exchanges. It uses English diplomacy as a locus for exploring English attitudes and practice towards queens

---

<sup>1</sup> Barbara Stephenson (2017) *The Power and Patronage of Marguerite de Navarre* (Aldershot: Ashgate); Jonathan A. Reid (2009) *King's Sister—Queen of Dissent: Marguerite of Navarre 1492-1549 and her Evangelical Network* (Leiden: Brill); Magdalena S. Sanchez (1998) *The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun: Women and Power at the Court of Philip III* (London: Johns Hopkins University Press).

<sup>2</sup> Erin A. Sadlack (2012) *The French Queen's Letters: Mary Tudor Brandon and the Politics of Marriage in Sixteenth-century Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave); Gary Ferguson & Mary B. McKinley (Eds) (2013) *A Companion to Marguerite de Navarre* (Leiden: Brill).

<sup>3</sup> See for example Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly & Adam Morton (Eds) (2017) *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer, and European Politics, c.1500-1800* (London: Routledge); Anne J. Cruz & Mihoko Suzuki (Eds) *The Rule of Women in Early Modern Europe* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press); Dagmar Eichberger, Wim N. Hüskens & Anne-Marie Legaré (Eds) (2010) *Women at the Burgundian Court: Presence and Influence = Femmes à la cour de Bourgogne: présence et influence* (Tournhout: Brepols); Dagmar Eichberger & Lisa Beaven (1995) Family Members and Political Allies: the Portrait Collection of Margaret of Austria, *Art Bulletin*, 77, pp. 225-48.

<sup>4</sup> For example Catherine L. Howey (2009) Fashioning Monarch: Women, Dress and Power in the Reign of Elizabeth I, 1558-1603, in Cruz & Suzuki (Eds), *Rule of Women*, pp. 142-56.

<sup>5</sup> For example F. Heal (2014) *The Power of Gifts: Gift-exchange in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), ch. 6; Linda Blair & Sheila Kormaroff (Eds) (2011) *Gifts of the Sultan: The Arts of Giving at the Islamic Courts* (London: Yale University Press).

<sup>6</sup> Maija Jansson (2005) Measured Reciprocity: English Ambassadorial Gift Exchange in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Centuries, *Journal of Early Modern History*, 9(3), pp. 348-70.

<sup>7</sup> For example Isabella Richefort (1998) Présents diplomatiques et diffusion de l'image de Louis XIV, in Lucien Bély & Isabella Richefort (Eds) *L'invention de la diplomatie: Moyen Age-temps modernes* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France), pp. 263-79.

consort and dowager, as well as the practices adopted by both English and foreign non-regnant queens in order to assert their place within diplomatic relations. As diplomatic practices were largely based on notions of reciprocity (with gradations to take account of status if necessary),<sup>8</sup> the prism of English relations offers insights into international practice more broadly. First the essay discusses the considerations behind involving non-regnant queens in diplomatic gift-giving, before examining the extent to which gifts to and from queens were gendered. It analyses how gift exchanges involving non-regnant queens could work in harmony, or in tension, with the diplomacy of their husbands and sons, and the ways in which gifting enabled queens to enhance their status or articulate their own political views. By focussing on the period from the reign of Henry VIII to the death of Anne of Denmark, this essay addresses a formative period in English—and European—diplomacy that witnessed a great expansion in the use of resident embassies within Europe and the establishing of regular diplomatic relations between England and several non-European powers.

Although it remained rare for queens dowager and consort to negotiate peace treaties<sup>9</sup> or for women to be given diplomatic assignments,<sup>10</sup> women were not precluded from involvement in other aspects of the diplomatic process: court women were important sources of information and potential conduits to their male relatives and spouses; they also provided informal contacts and opportunities for diplomatic sociability at court.<sup>11</sup> Queens consort were in a stronger position than other *Hofdamen* to fulfil these roles. Consorts were seen as a possible solution to enmity between princes because it was believed that forging familial links between the princes of Europe would bring binding alliances between them.<sup>12</sup> Interdynastic marriage gave consorts an important role as political and cultural intermediaries between their family of birth and their family by marriage.<sup>13</sup> For example, during the Danish king Christian IV's visit to Oxford in 1606, much was made of his relationship with his sister Anne and the close ties of friendship this forged between England and Denmark through her marriage to James VI/I.<sup>14</sup> But it was also hoped that a consort would advocate her birth family's interests at her husband's court. In March 1513, for instance, Henry VIII's ambassador told the king's sister Margaret, queen of Scotland, that she should 'be a mean at this tyme to the kyng her husband that he wolde kepe the peas'.<sup>15</sup> Consequently, queen consorts were given some consideration in diplomatic affairs. This was particularly true of those who had familial links in other courts and might be able to wield influence there, as well as with their husbands. Venetian ambassadors sent to England in Henry VIII's reign, for example, were instructed to present credentials to his first wife Catherine of Aragon and visited her regularly.<sup>16</sup> In Catherine's case, her utility was perceived to stem as much from

<sup>8</sup> On reciprocity in ceremonial practices see Jan Hennings (2017) *Russia and Courtly Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

<sup>9</sup> Joycelyne G. Russell (1992) *Diplomats at Work: Three Renaissance Studies* (Stroud: Alan Sutton), pp. 94-152.

<sup>10</sup> For a rare exception see Lucien Bély (2007) *L'art de la paix en Europe: Naissance de la diplomatie moderne XVI<sup>e</sup>–XVIII<sup>e</sup>* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France), pp. 213-24.

<sup>11</sup> Corinna Bastian, Eva Dade, Hillard von Thiessen & Katrin Keller (Eds) (2014) *Das Geschlecht der Diplomatie: Geschlechterrollen in den Außenbeziehungen vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Cologne: Böhlau).

<sup>12</sup> On the perceived benefits and perils of interdynastic marriage see John Watkins (2017) *After Lavinia: A Literary History of Premodern Marriage Diplomacy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

<sup>13</sup> Watanabe-O'Kelly & Morton (Eds) *Queens Consort*.

<sup>14</sup> Konigelige Bibliotek, Copenhagen, MS GKS 879 folio.

<sup>15</sup> British Library (BL) Cotton MS Caligula BVI, fo. 64r.

<sup>16</sup> For example Rawdon Brown et al. (Eds) (1864-1947; 38 vols in 40) *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice* (London: Longman, Roberts and Green) (CSPV), II 95, 179, 576, 614, 1147, III 974, V 316. References to calendars are to document number unless otherwise stated.

her position as the daughter of Ferdinand, king of Aragon, as her role as English queen. It was important to cultivate the good favour of queens who served as regents, as they wielded considerable power. No wonder, then, that Henry VIII regularly sent gifts to Margaret of Austria and Mary of Hungary, Charles V's regents in the Netherlands.<sup>17</sup> However, consorts easily lost their political value if they were widowed and had borne the king no children: when the French consort Mary Tudor was widowed in 1515, the Doge and Senate of Venice seemingly decided to keep the lavish gift that they had intended to present to her.<sup>18</sup>

The potential of queens consort to serve as intermediaries also meant that they were incorporated into the broader exchanges of gifts between courts. This was particularly noticeable at high-profile diplomatic celebrations, as shall be seen. Even within the ordinary gift-exchanges of English diplomacy, queens consort were growing in prominence during the sixteenth century. Whereas the range of consorts to whom Henry VII and Henry VIII regularly sent gifts was largely limited to relatives and regents, both Mary I and Elizabeth I, as queens regnant, engaged in gift exchanges with a wide range of male monarchs as well as their consorts, dowagers and queen mothers. In August 1554, for instance, Mary sent presents to the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, his sister Mary of Hungary, who was the Regent of the Netherlands, the French consort Catherine de Medici, and Christina of Denmark, dowager duchess and regent of Lorraine.<sup>19</sup> As more polities adopted resident diplomacy there was both more regular gift-giving within a given diplomatic relationship and a greater need for the resident ambassador and his principal to cultivate meaningful links to important figures at court, including queens consort and dowager. A further impetus for an increase in gifting to non-regnant queens, at least from an English perspective, may have been the advent of female monarchy in England, because the protocol associated with a married queen regnant or an unmarried queen regnant was uncharted territory and some aspects of the consort's protocol were likely blended with the monarch's to provide acceptable solutions. While consorts could also develop wide international networks of exchange these tended to be more gendered than the networks of queens regnant, focussing more on other consorts and queen regents and dowagers, than the leading (usually male) monarchs of the day. Anne of Denmark, for instance, engaged in regular gift exchanges with the queen consorts of Spain and France from an early date after her husband's accession to the English throne and later added further consorts including the duchess of Savoy and the grand duchess of Tuscany to her network. Beyond her familial ties to Denmark, the only foreign monarch with whom Anne regularly exchanged gifts was female: the Infanta Isabella, who ruled the Spanish Netherlands as co-sovereign with her husband Archduke Albert.

As English diplomatic contacts expanded beyond the European society of princes<sup>20</sup>, English diplomatic actors considered whether royal wives and female relatives should be included when giving gifts at court. The early lists of gifts distributed by English diplomats at the Ottoman court catalogue the Sultan and high ranking officials, but do not mention the sultan's wife or mother.<sup>21</sup> Yet the recommendation of Elizabeth's ambassador, Edward Barton, that the Sultana be given presents too was soon followed.<sup>22</sup> This decision was probably influenced by the knowledge that other polities included the Sultana when distributing gifts at the Sublime Porte.<sup>23</sup> They did so partly because they recognised that the

<sup>17</sup> For example *LP* I.ii 1966; XX.ii 748.

<sup>18</sup> *CSPV* II 575, 593.

<sup>19</sup> *CSPV* V 935.

<sup>20</sup> On this concept see Lucien Bély (1999) *La société des princes, XVIe–XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: A. Fayard).

<sup>21</sup> TNA SP 97/1, fos. 24v–25r, 97/2, fo. 66r.

<sup>22</sup> Susan Skilliter (1965) Three Letters from the Ottoman “Sultana” Sâfiye to Queen Elizabeth I, in Jean Aubin & Samuel Miklos Stern (Eds) *Documents from Islamic Chanceries* (Oxford: Cassirer), p. 144; BL Cotton MS Nero BXI, fo. 124r.

<sup>23</sup> BL Lansdowne MS 70, fo. 45r.

Walide Sultanas in particular had considerable influence over the Sultan (even if the two did not always agree) and partly because they found that the Sultanas were prepared to act as diplomatic intermediaries and that gifts smoothed the process.<sup>24</sup> At the Mughal court Sir Thomas Roe initially thought that the 'Queen' should not be included in the gifts dispensed, yet he nonetheless outlined which goods would be suitable for her. Ultimately he saw the expediency of presenting lavish gifts to Nur Jahan due to her influence at court: in 1617 when Emperor Jahangir was sent a glass chest, she was sent one too.<sup>25</sup> She later appointed herself the protector of English trade in India in return for first refusal of the English merchants' goods.<sup>26</sup> Elsewhere, pleasing royal women was a consideration when deciding upon what presents to send to the male ruler. The East India Company agents who recommended how best to establish good relations with Shah Abbas suggested that his presents include little dogs, purely because it was what the ladies of his court desired.<sup>27</sup> Even where the consort was less powerful, James VI/I considered it worthwhile to incorporate her into gift exchanges. Hence during Thomas Smythe's embassy to Muscovy in 1604-5 both the Russian empress and her daughter-in-law received gifts alongside their husbands.<sup>28</sup>

The queens' role as key consumers at court also made them a focus for diplomatic gifts, particularly for those polities seeking to enhance mercantile relations. Presents of items such as clothes and cloths almost certainly served a secondary purpose of advertising the products of the city or polity that sent them. An incident involving a queen regnant, Mary I, provides insights into how turning a sample of a commodity into a gift might encourage future business from the monarch and the wider courtly community. When the Venetian ambassador gave her parcels of coloured silk that she had strongly hinted she wanted, he did not ask for payment, but happily gave them as gifts. His reward came at a subsequent audience when Mary praised the silks in front of a crowded court.<sup>29</sup> The considerable spending power of queens consort and their influence on taste at court no doubt motivated several of the gifts they received, such as samples of cloth presented to Anne of Denmark in 1611 ostensibly from the Grand Duchess of Tuscany, but sent on her husband's orders.<sup>30</sup> Similar motivations probably underscored the incorporation of Nur Jahan in the list of key figures at the Mughal court presented with gifts by the English king and East India Company.

Whether regnant, regent, consort, or dowager queens gave, and were given, a wide array of items as diplomatic gifts ranging from silver plate to art to exotica. Most types of gift were deemed appropriate for both sexes; there were few items given to male rulers as gifts that were not also at some point given to a queen, including items that we might think of as more masculine such as animals associated with blood sports. Even armour and weapons, which were predominantly given by and to men (especially those items intended for practical rather

---

<sup>24</sup> See Leslie Peirce (1993) *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), esp. pp. 91-112, 219-28.

<sup>25</sup> William Foster (Ed) (1926) *The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe to India, 1615-19* (London: Humphrey Milford), pp. 99, 386.

<sup>26</sup> W. Noel Sainsbury (Ed) (1859) *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: East India, China and Japan, Vol. 3* (London: HMSO), 172-3, 186.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 122.

<sup>28</sup> Alfred Maskell (1884) *Russian Art and Art Objects in Russia* (London: Chapman and Hall), pp. 231-2.

<sup>29</sup> CSPV VI 213.

<sup>30</sup> Medici MS 4814, fo. 75; Medici MS 4189 (unfoliated), Ottaviano Lotti to Belisario di Francesco Vinta, 12 May 1611, 1 June 1611. Transcriptions or digital images of Medici manuscripts were consulted on BIA: <http://bia.medici.org/DocSources/Home.do>. Anne also received dolls that were perhaps intended to showcase materials and fashions: *ibid.*, 10 October 1610.

than ceremonial uses), were also occasionally given by and to female royals.<sup>31</sup> The list of items that Roe considered suitable presents for the wife of the Mughal Emperor Jahangir provides a good indication of the range of items thought appropriate. He suggested items such as ‘fine needlework, toyes, fair bone lace, cutwork, and some handsome wrought waistcoat, [or] sweetbags’. While his recommendations were largely focussed on clothes and domestic articles, they were not solely determined by gender for he also noted that ‘any faire China bedsteads, or cabinets or trunks of Japan are here rich presents’.<sup>32</sup> However, some gifts were designed to appeal specifically to women, such as the jewelled, rock crystal casket filled with curios for ladies that Anne of Denmark received from the Duke of Savoy in 1613.<sup>33</sup>

One category of gifts features more commonly in gift exchanges involving royal women than those involving royal men: items of clothing. Anne of Denmark, for instance, received several items of clothing from Margaret, queen of Spain, in April 1606, including a robe, girdle and cap.<sup>34</sup> Clothes were used to express political hierarchies through, for instance, the bestowal of livery or ceremonial robes.<sup>35</sup> As wearing clothes that had been gifts could imply political submission kings rarely retained them for long.<sup>36</sup> But clothing gifts given by consorts and dowagers were less politically charged as these queens did not possess sovereignty in their own right. Hence the sable fur coat that Cecilia, Margravine of Baden-Rodemachern sent to Elizabeth in 1565 was not considered problematic.<sup>37</sup> In such circumstances the affective nature of the gift dominated and the clothes were deemed to function as evidence of the loving relationship between the two parties. This was also true when the sartorial styles of the queen’s normative system were very different from the giver’s, such as when Elizabeth’s ambassador encouraged the Ottoman Sultana Safiye, consort of Murad III and mother of Mehmet III, to send the queen a ‘sute of princely attire being after the Turkish fashion’ which he believed would ‘for the rarenesse thereof be acceptable’. Elizabeth graciously accepted the outfit—a cloth of silver upper gown, an under gown, and a girdle—in 1594.<sup>38</sup> If she had any reservations about doing so, they did not reach Constantinople: Safiye sent a similar gift and a pair of shoes five years later when she was Walide Sultan.<sup>39</sup>

Needlework gifts, such as the embroidered handkerchiefs that Safiye sent Elizabeth, were also largely the preserve of female royals.<sup>40</sup> Such items could be personalised with poignant symbolism and convey intimacy, especially those created either by the queens themselves, or their ladies, or both, like the bonnets that Catherine of Aragon gave to the young attendants of

<sup>31</sup> For example TNA SP 1/183 fo. 21r; BL Harley MS 6992, fo. 90r; Luc Duerloo (2002) *Dynasty and Piety: Archduke Albert (1598-1621) and Habsburg Political Culture in an Age of Religious Wars* (Farnham: Ashgate), p. 341.

<sup>32</sup> Foster (Ed) *Thomas Roe*, p. 99.

<sup>33</sup> CSPV XII 809; TNA SP 92/1/2, fo. 109r, 14/74, fo. 42r.

<sup>34</sup> John Nichols (Ed) (1828) *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First* (London: J. B. Nichols), II, pp. 47-8.

<sup>35</sup> Ulinka Rublack (2010) *Dressing Up: Cultural Identity in Renaissance Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), ch. 4; Stewart Gordon (2003) *Robes of Honour: khil’at in Pre-colonial and Colonial India* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press).

<sup>36</sup> Maria Hayward (2004) Fashion, Finance, Foreign Politics and the Wardrobe of Henry VIII, in Catherine Richardson (Ed) *Clothing Culture, 1350-1650* (Aldershot: Ashgate), pp. 175-6.

<sup>37</sup> Victor Klarwill (Ed) (1928) *Queen Elizabeth and Some Foreigners* (London: J. Lane/The Bodley Head), p. 238.

<sup>38</sup> TNA SP 97/2, fo. 230r; Richard Hakluyt (1599-1600) *The principal nauigations, voyages, traffiques and discoueries of the English nations* (London: George Bishop, Ralph Newberie & Robert Barker), p. 306; Skilliter, ‘Three Letters’, pp. 147-8.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 151; William Foster (Ed) (1932) *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant, 1584-1602, with his Autobiography* (London: Hakluyt Society), pp. 184-5.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.; TNA SP 97/2, fo. 230r.



Francis I of France in 1520.<sup>41</sup> As Lisa Klein observed, ‘a hand-wrought gift has a particular intimacy, authority, and efficacy’ due to the time and care taken to create them.<sup>42</sup> When Catherine de Medici, the French queen consort, let it be known that she and her ladies were personally preparing ‘certeyn fayre works & gaye geare’ for Mary I, it was an attempt to enhance the political capital of her gifts.<sup>43</sup> Queens regnant also exploited the status of gifts they had created personally: Mary, Queen of Scots, sought to win Elizabeth round with presents she had embroidered herself after her deposition from the Scottish throne.<sup>44</sup> Another distinctive feature of some gifts given to and between queens was that they were scented.<sup>45</sup> Perfumed gifts of a domestic nature were probably deemed particularly appropriate for queens, whether regnant or otherwise. The cabinet that Marie de Medici, the queen consort of France, sent to Anne of Denmark shortly after James’s accession to the English throne in 1603, was described as ‘curiously wrought and inlaid all over with musk and amber grease [ambergris], which maketh a sweet savour’. Inside each compartment were further items including flowers and jewels for dressing the hair.<sup>46</sup> In the wake of the Gunpowder Plot, Anne received another gift designed to provide olfactory stimulation. The Spanish queen Margaret sent her a robe adorned with forty-eight gold ‘tagges’ filled with ambergris and two ‘karkanets of ambergreece’.<sup>47</sup> Whenever the queen moved while wearing the dress, the tags would move and the aroma be renewed. Queens clearly considered perfume and scented items prestigious and useful. Elizabeth I perfumed at least one letter she sent to the Sultana Safiye, while Safiye solicited perfumed waters for the face and ‘odiferous oils for the hands’ as gifts from the English queen.<sup>48</sup> In appreciating that creating an olfactory, as well as a visual or material, sensory experience might make their gift stand out, the givers of such gifts were in good company. The diplomatic hospitality of the Genoese Republic in this period, for instance, utilised scents in order to impress foreign guests.<sup>49</sup>

Examining how queens consort participated in gift exchanges at high-profile diplomatic events brings into sharp relief the ways in which their involvement in international gifting complemented their spouses’ objectives. When Henry VIII met Francis I at the so-called Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520, their queens’ gift-giving paralleled the more extensive gifting that took place between the two kings. Catherine gave Queen Claude of France several lavishly caparisoned horses and received a litter of cloth of gold complete with mules and pages in return.<sup>50</sup> The queens presented gifts to non-royals too. Catherine gave some of Francis I’s younger gentlemen bonnets, while Francis’s mother bestowed a jewelled crucifix on Henry’s chief minister Cardinal Wolsey.<sup>51</sup> Diplomatic gift exchanges needed to be reciprocated, but that reciprocity was not always direct. The presence of the queens also

<sup>41</sup> Glenn Richardson (2013) *The Field of the Cloth of Gold* (New Haven: Yale University Press), p. 165.

<sup>42</sup> Lisa Klein (1997) Your Humble Handmaid: Elizabethan Gifts of Needlework, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 50(2), p. 471. See also Cordula Bischoff (2007-2008) Presents for Princesses: Gender in Royal Receiving and Giving, *Studies in the Decorative Arts*, 15(1), pp. 33-7.

<sup>43</sup> TNA SP 69/2, fo. 14r.

<sup>44</sup> Klein, Your Humble Handmaid, p. 476.

<sup>45</sup> TNA SP 69/4, fo. 128v; Martin A. S. Hume (Ed) (1892-99) *Calendar of Letters and State Papers Relating to English Affairs Preserved Principally in the Archives at Simancas* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode) II 519. Kings occasionally received scented items: BL Arundel MS 97, fo. 167v.

<sup>46</sup> Edmund Lodge (1838) *Illustrations of British History, Biograph and Manners in the Reigns of Henry VIII to James I* (London: J. Chidley), III, p. xxxi.

<sup>47</sup> Nichols, *Progresses*, II, pp. 47-8.

<sup>48</sup> Skilliter, Three Letters, pp. 132, 143.

<sup>49</sup> Giulia Galastro (2017) Wondrous Welcome: Materiality and the Senses in Diplomatic Hospitality in Sixteenth-century Genoa, in Sowerby & Hennings (Eds) *Practices of Diplomacy*, pp. 104, 106.

<sup>50</sup> CSPV III 94.

<sup>51</sup> Richardson, *Field of the Cloth of Gold*, p. 165.

permitted diagonal gifting, as the queens each presented gifts to the other's husband: at their parting Catherine presented Francis with a diamond and a ruby ring, while Claude gave Henry two rings of equal value. The queens' gifting patterns worked in parallel with their hosting duties: on some occasions they hosted each other, on others they entertained the other's husband.<sup>52</sup> Similarly, during the celebrations that marked the Anglo-Spanish peace in 1604-5, Anne of Denmark and Philip III's wife Margaret lavishly bestowed gifts that complemented those given by their husbands. Anne sent the Spanish queen richly caparisoned horses and jewels; she received jewels, portraits and two palfreys with silver furniture in return.<sup>53</sup> Their mutual exchanges thus served to reinforce the peace and amity between the two realms. Outside of such special occasions, gifts to queens were sometimes reciprocated by their husbands' sending presents to the wife of the giver,<sup>54</sup> but consorts sent gifts themselves too. Nonetheless, such exchanges were often interpreted as reinforcing the exchanges between their husbands.<sup>55</sup>

A queen consort's non-regnal status brought flexibility that could be used to aid their husband's diplomacy in circumstances for which there was no direct precedent. Shortly after the accession of England's first queen regnant, Mary I, the French ambassador at her court recommended that the French queen consort, Catherine de Medici, send her gifts to indicate that Henry II, the French king, was interested in furthering the amity between France and England.<sup>56</sup> Presenting the gift as being from Catherine, rather than her husband had clear advantages. Should a king send a present to Mary, who was unmarried, it might be (mis)interpreted as sign that he was interested in negotiating a marriage alliance. But a gift from his wife could continue the amity without prejudice.

A foreign-born queen consort could further her husband's foreign policy by acting as an intermediary in international gift-giving between her male relatives. Catherine of Aragon sent her father, King Ferdinand, information about the sorts of gifts that would be appreciated by her English husband, suggesting in 1509, for instance in 1509 that Ferdinand send Henry a jennet and a Neapolitan and Sicilian horse.<sup>57</sup> She furthered her value as an intermediary by telling her father how his gifts had been received and thereby helping him to calibrate future gifts accordingly.<sup>58</sup> Equally, queens consort could assert their importance as political conduits and holders of political knowledge through the recommendations they made to other rulers (and their intermediaries) about gifts that would be well received by their husbands and sons and even beyond the immediate circle of the royal couple. For instance, Francis I's sister, Marguerite, queen consort of Navarre, sought to further Anglo-French relations by making recommendations about where Henry VIII should bestow gifts at the French court.<sup>59</sup> Gifts were an important means by which queens kept in touch with, and expressed their support for, their far distant relatives. Anne of Denmark frequently exchanged gifts with her Danish relatives. She received several presents from her brother ranging from horses, to plate,

---

<sup>52</sup> CSPV III 76, 79, 90, 94; Edward Hall (1548) *The vnion of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre & Yorke* (London: Richard Grafton), DDiir-vir.

<sup>53</sup> Gustav Ungerer (1998) Juan Pantoja de la Cruz and the Circulation of Gifts Between the English and Spanish Courts in 1604/5, *Sederi*, 9, p. 68

<sup>54</sup> Bischoff, Presents, p. 20.

<sup>55</sup> Thomas Birch (Ed) (1848) *The Court and Times of James the First* (London: Henry Colburn), I, p. 260.

<sup>56</sup> Abbé de Vertot (Ed) (1763) *Ambassades de Messieurs de Noailles en Angleterre* (Paris: A. Leyde), II, pp. 145-6.

<sup>57</sup> LP I.i 127.

<sup>58</sup> G. A. Bergenroth et al. (Ed) (1862-1954) *Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers Relating to Negotiations between England and Spain* (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts) (CSPS) II 288.

<sup>59</sup> TNA, SP 1/158, fo. 148v; LP XV 459, 543. On Marguerite's Anglophilia see Heather M. Vose (1985) Marguerite of Navarre: that 'Righte English Woman', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 16(3), 315-44

to jewels and mirrors.<sup>60</sup> In late 1616 she reportedly reciprocated a gift from Christian IV with a suite of presents that included a bed with opulent brocaded hangings.<sup>61</sup> Anne also sent presents to her mother ranging from jewels to richly caparisoned horses.<sup>62</sup> Through material means, she maintained the affective bonds with her relatives. But just as importantly, the movement of these gifts provided evidence to foreign (and domestic) political actors that Anne's relationship with her Oldenburg relatives remained close. Similarly, Henry VIII's sister Margaret, who had married James IV of Scotland, exchanged gifts with her brother on an intermittent basis while queen consort and then queen dowager of Scotland. In December 1522, for instance, she thanked the English king for sending her a diamond and reciprocated with a ring as a token of her own regard.<sup>63</sup> Margaret recognised that the gifts she received from Henry redounded to both their credit, writing to thank him in December 1534 for 'syndry tokkynys of rememberans // quhihe not only salbe to *our* honour / bot in lyke maner unto zour grace'.<sup>64</sup> She also appreciated that her gifts might be a means of articulating her commitment to a pro-English stance. As tensions began to escalate between Henry VIII and James IV in the spring of 1513, Margaret asserted her connection to Henry by sending gifts to her brother, her sister Mary, and Catherine of Aragon, with reassurances that she would endeavour to persuade her husband to maintain the peace between the two countries and not support France, even though Henry VIII had launched a campaign on French soil.<sup>65</sup>

Many of the gifts Anne of Denmark exchanged were a means of asserting her familial identity, something that her relatives recognised benefitted all involved. When, on the eve of his war against Sweden, Christian sent Anne jewels that included a self-referential diamond jewel formed of a C and a four, he was inviting her to assert their relationship visually each time she wore it. The rhetoric that accompanied the gift reinforced Christian's invitation—he asked her to keep it for his sake. Anna's response to the C4 gift further fortified the bond between the siblings. She reportedly declared the perfect love between them and her desire to see him triumph militarily.<sup>66</sup> The C4 jewel appears in several of Anne's portraits.<sup>67</sup> By wearing it Anne emphasised her connection to the Danish crown in two ways: through the iconography of the jewel and through the knowledge that it had come from her brother.

Early modern royals exchanged portraits, at least in part, as a means of keeping up to date with the appearance of their far-flung relatives.<sup>68</sup> Anne's portrait exchanges with Christian provided a further means of asserting her dynastic identity and keeping herself in his considerations. When she gave him a portrait in 1605, she asked him to 'wear the same to please us and thereby think on us with brotherly affection just as we wear your portrait not only on our dress, but with the devoted memory of a sister'.<sup>69</sup> This portrait may have reciprocated the picture Christian had given Anne in the summer of 1603, for which she had offered her 'sisterly thanks'.<sup>70</sup> She continued to exchange portraits with her brother

<sup>60</sup> For example Medici MS 4191 (unfoliated), avviso from London, 19 August 1616; CSPV XII 446; Nichols, *Progresses*, I, p. 604.

<sup>61</sup> CSPV XIV 577.

<sup>62</sup> Frederick Devon (Ed) (1836) *Issues of the Exchequer, Being Payments Made out of His Majesty's Revenue During the Reign of King James I* (London: John Rodwell), p. 209; CSPV X 566.

<sup>63</sup> BL Cotton MS Caligula BVI, fo. 312v.

<sup>64</sup> TNA, SP 49/4, fo. 70r.

<sup>65</sup> LP I.i 1775.

<sup>66</sup> CSPV XII 250.

<sup>67</sup> For example National Portrait Gallery no. 127. James Knowles (2003) *Anna of Denmark, Elizabeth I and Images of Royalty* in Clare McManus (Ed) *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens* (London: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 24, 26, 29.

<sup>68</sup> Lorne Campbell (1990) *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait Painting in the 14<sup>th</sup> 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Centuries* (London: Yale University Press), ch. 8.

<sup>69</sup> Quoted in Diana Scarisbrick (1986) *Anne of Denmark's Jewellery: The Old and the New*, *Apollo*, 123, p. 234.

<sup>70</sup> Rigsarkivet, Statens Arkiver, Copenhagen, TKUA, SD, England AII 2, Anne to Christian IV, 8 August 1603.



throughout her life. During his visit in 1606, for instance, he gave her a jewel-encrusted miniature.<sup>71</sup> As these jewels needed repairing at various points, Anne probably did wear the miniatures Christian gave her.<sup>72</sup> When Habsburg regents or consorts wore portraits of their king they articulated the political authority invested in them by their male relatives.<sup>73</sup> A consort sporting an image of a member of her birth family, however, highlighted her dynastic links and in doing so, signalled preferred alliances within foreign policy.

There were a number of ways in which gifts provided queens consort and dowager with opportunities to assert their status. At the most basic level, gifts were an important means by which controversial queens could gain international recognition. By sending a queen a present or receiving one from her, a foreign ruler was acknowledging the legitimacy of the queen's position. This was particularly important for Anne Boleyn, whose claim to be Henry's companion and then his first 'legitimate' wife was contested both at home and abroad.<sup>74</sup> How foreign rulers treated Anne sent valuable signals about how they viewed her position vis-à-vis that of Catherine of Aragon. While Catherine's nephew, the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V, and his ambassador Eustace Chapuys saw Anne as Henry's concubine, other rulers recognised Anne's *de facto* position as England's queen by incorporating her into their patterns of gifting, thereby also implicitly accepting the legitimacy of her position. Francis I, king of France, no doubt acknowledged Anne as he hoped to secure Henry's support in his wars against Charles. At his Calais interview with Henry in October 1532, Francis first sent Anne a large diamond as a gift, then acknowledged her publicly. Shortly after her coronation, she received a sumptuous litter, three mules and furniture for them from the French king. Anne reportedly took the litter for a journey of three miles almost immediately.<sup>75</sup> In doing so, she no doubt had two goals: first to show her appreciation for the gift and strengthen ties with France, aware that reports of how she had received it would make their way back to Francis.<sup>76</sup> Secondly, to demonstrate to the English political community that the French king had acknowledged her position and thus enhance her claim to be England's true queen. For Margaret Tudor, displaying gifts from her brother underlined her status as queen dowager of Scotland even after she had lost the regency and left Scotland in 1515.<sup>77</sup>

Queens could also gain recognition by sending gifts to foreign royals: either the intended recipient would have to refuse the gift and so publicly reject the sender or they would receive it, however begrudgingly, and in doing so imply that they accepted the status of the queen sending it. Giving gifts was therefore a risky strategy for consorts whose position was contested. Anne Boleyn appears to have played it fairly safe. In 1534 she sent a 'loving token' to Henry VIII's sister Margaret, which the dowager queen of Scotland willingly accepted from 'our derest cistir ye quen', believing it 'not only sallbe to our honor bot Inlyk manur unto his grace & unto our derest cistre' honourable.<sup>78</sup> Margaret's relationship to Henry made her a more certain recipient than other queens dowager. Queens dowager also solicited the recognition that inter-princely gift-giving brought, especially if they served as regent for an infant son. This probably explains why Marie de Medici, whose gifts to England had previous

---

<sup>71</sup> Birch, *Court*, I, p. 67.

<sup>72</sup> Archibald Constable (Ed) (1822) *Memoirs of George Heriot, Jeweller to James VI* (Edinburgh: Archibald Constable), pp. 205, 217.

<sup>73</sup> Rosemarie Mulcahy (2004) *Philip II, Patron of the Arts* (Dublin: Four Courts Press), pp. 280-2

<sup>74</sup> Henry argued that his first marriage to Catherine was invalid.

<sup>75</sup> Eric Ives (1986) *Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell), pp. 157-61, 183; *LP* VI 720.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*; *CSPS* IV.ii 1091.

<sup>77</sup> *LP* II.i 1350. Marguerite of Navarre also invoked fraternal gifts for political leverage: see Stephenson, *Power and Patronage*, pp. 133-4.

<sup>78</sup> TNA SP 49/4, fo. 72r.

focused on Anne of Denmark, shifted her attention to King James following the assassination of her husband, for instance sending a gift of rare fruit trees in 1611.<sup>79</sup>

A consort could use their own acceptance or rejection of diplomatic gifts to comment on the legitimacy of foreign royals or even signal their views of their husband's policies. When it was (wrongly) believed that Anne of Denmark had accepted a gift of relics from Pope Clement VIII in 1603-4, it caused a minor scandal, not least because the relics carried with them an indulgence for those who prayed for England—and James's—conversion to Catholicism. Had Anne accepted the gift, it would have been a strong statement against her husband's ecclesiastical and theological stance. This same instance highlights the limits of consorts' autonomy in the sphere of international gift-giving: the present was intercepted by English diplomatic agents and returned by her husband before Anne was confronted with the decision of whether to receive it.<sup>80</sup>

Queens could use gifts to diplomatic personnel to complement, or even to complicate the king's diplomatic messages. Whereas English kings were expected to mark an ambassador's departure with some form of reward—the type and value of which became increasingly standardised across the period—no such expectations attached to their consorts in the sixteenth century. There is little evidence that English queen consorts commonly gave gifts to ambassadors at their departure in Henry VIII's reign. By James's accession, it is possible that there was little institutional memory of English diplomatic protocol with regards to consorts as any precedents were over half a century old: Philip of Spain was both Mary's consort and a king in his own right, while Elizabeth's unmarried status meant there had been no consort for forty-five years. This no doubt gave Anne of Denmark more flexibility about when and to whom she bestowed gifts.

Although there is no suggestion that Anne of Denmark routinely presented departing ambassadors with gifts, she did do so relatively frequently, perhaps in part because several ambassadors felt the need to take their leave from her as well as James.<sup>81</sup> For instance Anne gave diamonds or other jewels to Venetian ambassadors in 1607, 1609, 1611, and 1615, as well as to ambassadors from French in 1613 and Savoy in 1612 and 1613.<sup>82</sup> Often such gifts were interpreted as a sign of especial favour.<sup>83</sup> When the Savoyard ambassador left in December 1614 his peers observed that took with him more than the usual gifts of plate, had received plate from both the king and the queen and that Anne had additionally given him a diamond ring.<sup>84</sup> In her choice of when and to whom she gave departure gifts, a consort could signal that she agreed with the favour shown to the ambassadors by the king and could indicate that she supported the goals of the ambassador's mission.

Departure gifts were also a means by which queens could shape their overseas reputations. Some of the gifts Anne of Denmark bestowed on departing ambassadors conveyed her magnificence such as the chain of gold fashioned like snakes, enamelled in green and set with diamonds that the Spanish ambassador Juan Conde de Villa Mediana received in 1606.<sup>85</sup> Other gifts promoted her image abroad, for several ambassadors left the English court having received portraits of Anne mounted in various different types of jewels. Furthermore several of these portrait gifts encompassed and promoted the family unit, or subsections of it,

---

<sup>79</sup> TNA SP 14/67, fos. 82r, 84r.

<sup>80</sup> Medici MS 4184, fos. 11r, 15r; *CSPV* X, 118.

<sup>81</sup> *CSPV* XIV 94.

<sup>82</sup> *CSPV* X 739; XI 523; XII 250, 253, 539, 710; XIII 2, 53; XIV 125, 127, 139; Huntington Library, HM 2904, fo. 300r.

<sup>83</sup> For example *CSPV* XI 936.

<sup>84</sup> Medici MS 4191 (unfoliated) Avviso 11 December 1614; *CSPV* XIII 543.

<sup>85</sup> Devon, *Issues*, p. 59.

underlining Anne's importance to the Stuart dynasty.<sup>86</sup> Several of Anne's presents to departing ambassadors materially memorialised the queen, such as the jewel with an AR monogram on it—for Anna Regina—given to the count of Aremberg.<sup>87</sup> Another means by which consorts might promote their image overseas or express their views on foreign affairs was through their treatment of the wives and children of ambassadors. Gifts were an integral part of this. As resident ambassadors became more common, and as ambassadors increasingly hailed from secular, rather than clerical backgrounds, ambassadors' wives and even children became more common at court. Consorts often entertained ambassadresses and even used them as conduits for political messages that she wished to convey to the ambassador.<sup>88</sup> Elizabeth I had occasionally extended gifts to ambassadresses at their departure from the court. In April 1579, for instance, the Portuguese ambassador received a jewel for his wife as well as the standard cupboard of plate.<sup>89</sup> By extending the gifting framework beyond the customary boundaries, such actions signalled the monarch's high esteem. Anne appears to have done so on a more regular basis. Several ambassadresses took leave of James's queen before returning home.<sup>90</sup> By 1612 it was thought noteworthy if an ambassador's wife did not see the queen before their departure.<sup>91</sup> A member of an ambassador's family receiving a gift from James' queen was seen as an especial mark of favour, whether the gift came at the end of the ambassador's mission or during it.<sup>92</sup> In 1605 the wives of the main ambassadors who had negotiated the Anglo-Spanish peace received presents from the queen.<sup>93</sup> On some occasions, Anne gave gifts to both the departing ambassador and his wife, as in 1606 when the French ambassador and ambadress both received a picture of gold set with stone.<sup>94</sup> Three years later, when James was eager to express the strength of his friendship with France through bestowing gifts on the ongoing French ambassador and his family, Anne complemented the sentiment by giving presents to the ambassador's wife and daughter.<sup>95</sup> In such instances the gesture of ostensible support for the mission was difficult to miss. Bestowing gifts on ambassadresses became a means by which consorts could indicate what they thought of particular inter-princely relationships. For instance the diamond jewellery Anne of Denmark gave to Anna Maria de Camudio, the archducal ambassador's wife, and her son in July 1615, was both a sign of support for the Archdukes and of her sympathies towards Catholics; the ambadress had recently sought Anne's intercession to secure the release and exile of several Catholic priests.<sup>96</sup> As this incident shows, while many of Anne's gifts to ambassadors and their families complemented those of James, reinforcing the good relations he strove to maintain,

---

<sup>86</sup> Tracey A. Sowerby (2015) *Negotiating the Royal Image: Portrait Exchanges in Elizabethan and Early Stuart Diplomacy*, in Helen Hackett (Ed) *Early Modern Exchanges: Dialogues Between Cultures and Nations 1550-1800* (Aldershot: Ashgate), pp. 121-2.

<sup>87</sup> Devon, *Issues*, p. 16.

<sup>88</sup> CSPV XII 382, 388. See Florian Kühnel (2017) 'Minister-like Cleverness, Understanding and Influence on Affairs': Ambassadresses in Early Modern Courtly Ceremonies and Everyday Business, in Sowerby & Hennings (Eds) *Practices of Diplomacy*, pp. 130-46; Laura Oliván Santaliestra (2016) Lady Anne Fanshawe, Ambadress of England at the Court of Madrid (1664-1666), in Glenda Sluga & Carolyn James (Eds) *Women, Diplomacy and International Politics since 1500* (London: Routledge), pp. 68-85.

<sup>89</sup> CSP *Simancas*, II 566.

<sup>90</sup> For example CSPV XIII 901.

<sup>91</sup> Huntington Library, HM 2904, fo. 222r.

<sup>92</sup> Medici MS 4914 (unfoliated), avviso from London, 25 March 1618.

<sup>93</sup> TNA SP14/14, fo. 133r; Devon, *Issues*, p. 29.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 49.

<sup>95</sup> Medici MS 4189 (unfoliated), Ottaviano di Lotti to Belisario di Francesco Vinta 29 July 1609.

<sup>96</sup> Medici MS 4191 (unfoliated), avviso, 7 August 1616; TNA SP 14/81, fos. 49r.

but others articulated an independent position, whether on the treatment of Catholics or potential spouses for their children.<sup>97</sup>

A consort could deliberately contrive her reception of a diplomatic gift for political advantage or to communicate a particular message, as Anne Boleyn's trip in the coach she received from Francis I indicates. Recipients carefully calculated their physical interaction with the gift or the rhetoric they used when discussing it or a combination of the two in order to shape the relationship between the parties involved. James VI/I's consort, Anne, utilised the acceptance of gifts from the Infanta Isabella to present herself as favourably disposed towards the Spanish Netherlands. In 1604 Anne accepted a miniature portrait of Isabella with the declaration that 'their friendship was indissoluble as a knot and as strong as a rock';<sup>98</sup> on another occasion when presented pictures of both Archdukes, Anne asked how she might reciprocate, thus indicating her willingness to act as a favourable intermediary in English relations with them.<sup>99</sup> Meanwhile, regnant queens sought to deepen their links with consorts by interacting with the gifts consorts had sent. After receiving a gift from the English King in June 1605, Isabella extended the discourse surrounding James's gifts to incorporate presents sent separately by his wife. First the Infanta praised the exquisite embroidery on part of James's present (some saddlecloths) as surpassing that of the famous Milanese embroideries. Then she asserted that the needlework on the waistcoats and pillowcases she had formerly received from Anne exceeded the best that she had seen in Spain.<sup>100</sup>

Their reception of diplomatic gifts could help non-regnant queens to carve out a niche for themselves within inter-princely relations. The Ottoman Sultana Safiye understood that her responses to Elizabeth I's presents shaped her relationship with the English queen. Safiye used her gift exchanges (and correspondence) with Elizabeth to present herself as the English queen's champion at her son's court. For instance she 'made a greate demonstration of Joy by hir Agent or Aga and tooke itt [the present] very gratfully' to the English ambassador's agent and made a point of 'professing hir selfe readye to doe all the service she could for q. and our nation and that I should bouldly come to his Agent or Aga for any business *whatsoever*'.<sup>101</sup> The presents she received from England also offered Safiye opportunities to assert her position at the Ottoman court and advertise her international connections. Perhaps most noticeably, after receiving a jewel encrusted coach from Elizabeth, she had 'often tymes byn abroad in the Coache' with the sultan, thereby demonstrating her appreciation of the gift while simultaneously maximising its value to her by displaying it before a wide section of political society.<sup>102</sup>

Once given, gifts that remained in the queen's possession could become the foci of further political discourse, such as the portraits given to Anne of Denmark that featured in her discussions of potential interdynastic marriages.<sup>103</sup> Others could be exploited for political gain. When faced with a significant reduction in her dower and political exclusion in 1519, Margaret, queen dowager of Scotland, tried to persuade her brother to help her by invoking presents he had earlier sent her. Casting Henry VIII as her only hope of relief, she explained that if succour did not arrive soon she would be forced to sell 'my jewels an sych things as I gat from your grace' in the past 'for faut that I haf no thyng to spend', which she argued

---

<sup>97</sup> CSPV XII 202.

<sup>98</sup> Quoted in Duerloo, *Dynasty and Piety*, p. 174

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 168.

<sup>100</sup> TNA SP 77/7, fo. 187r-v.

<sup>101</sup> Skilliter, *Three Letters*, pp. 132-3, 139-40, 151; TNA SP 97/4, fo. 49v.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 50r.

<sup>103</sup> Sowerby, *Negotiating*, pp. 131-3.

would be 'gret dyshonor to me and no honour to your grace'.<sup>104</sup> But such exchanges could also leave hostages to fortune. Margaret was apparently accused of supporting Henry over her son in 1536 because of the gifts she had received from England.<sup>105</sup>

As diplomatic contact between polities became more frequent thanks to the widespread adoption of resident diplomacy in Europe non-regnant queens were given more opportunities to engage in inter-princely relations. Diplomatic gifts were just part of this phenomenon, but one that became increasingly important across the period examined in this article. Whereas Henry VIII's first consort engaged in limited gift exchanges, the range of occasions and diplomatic actors to whom James VI/I's wife presented gifts was much more extensive. Throughout the period, diplomatic gifts were an important political tool for non-regnant queens. Their husbands, too, benefitted from the involvement of consorts in international gift-giving. Non-regnant queens had more relative flexibility over when and to whom they could send gifts than did monarchs. Even effeminate gifts, such as handmade food, could be rendered acceptable if presented as being sent from a royal woman as well as the king, like the pasties that Henry VIII received from Francis I and his sister in January 1541.<sup>106</sup> This simultaneously created opportunities for the queens. Through giving and receiving gifts, queens could bolster their position, indicate whether they were favourably disposed to a particular ruling house or diplomatic mission, and seek to establish their own connections to diplomats and foreign rulers. They could exploit the material and visual qualities of the gifts to shape their international reputations, while the non-verbal communication that gift-exchange entailed might even permit consorts and dowagers to articulate political stances different from, or even opposed to, those of their spouses or sons.

---

<sup>104</sup> BL Cotton MS Caligula B I, fo. 246v.

<sup>105</sup> *LP* X 862.

<sup>106</sup> *LP* XVI 368, 436, 449.